arXiv:1303.1598v2 [math.OC] 13 Mar 2013

Conditions for Existence of Dual Certificates in Rank One Semidefinite Problems

Paul Hand

Department of Mathematics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, MA 02139

March 15, 2013

Abstract

We study the existence of dual certificates in convex minimization problems where a matrix X_0 is to be recovered under semidefinite and linear constraints. Dual certificates exist if and only if the problem satisfies strong duality and the dual problem attains its optimum. Because the dual problem may fail to attain its optimum, and near-optimal dual variables may necessarily diverge, optimization algorithms that rely on convergencee of dual variables lose their theoretical foundation. In the case that X_0 is rank 1, we prove that dual certificates are guaranteed to exist if the linear measurement matrices can not be recombined to form something positive and orthogonal to X_0. If the measurements can be recombined in this way, the problem is equivalent to one that is 'completed' with additional linear constraints. That completed problem is guaranteed to have a dual certificate at the minimizer. If a set of measurement matrices is not complete in this way, there is a convex problem for which a dual certificate does not exist at a minimizer.

1 Introduction

We consider the problem of showing that $\mathbf{X}_0$ is a minimizer to the semidefinite program

$$\min f(\mathbf{X}) \text{ subject to } \mathbf{X} \succeq 0, \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{b}, \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\text{sym}}$ is a symmetric and real-valued matrix, f is convex and continuous everywhere, $\mathcal{A}$ is linear, and $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}_0) = \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Let $\langle \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}\rangle = \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{Y}^*\mathbf{X})$ be the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product. Matrix orthogonality is understood to be with respect to this inner product. The linear measurements $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{b}$ can be written as

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X})_i = \langle \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}_i\rangle = b_i \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m,$$

for certain symmetric matrices $\mathbf{A}_i$. Note that the adjoint of $\mathcal{A}$ is given by $\mathcal{A}^*\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \mathbf{A}_i$.

A case of particular interest is when $\mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{x}_0\mathbf{x}_0^*$ is rank one. For example, the vector phase retrieval problem motivated by X-ray crystallography can be written as a rank one matrix recovery problem through a process called lifting [4]. That matrix recovery problem can be solved through PhaseLift [7], where $f(\mathbf{X}) = \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{X})$ and $\mathbf{A}_i = \mathbf{z}\mathbf{z}_i^*$ for vectors $\mathbf{z}_i$. This problem can also be viewed as a feasibility problem, where $f(\mathbf{X}) \equiv 0$ [8, 5]. Another example is the compressive phase retrieval problem [11, 12], where $\mathbf{X}_0$ is also presumed to be sparse. In this case $f(\mathbf{X}) = \|\mathbf{X}\|_1 + c \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{X})$, where the first term is the entry-wise ℓ^1 norm of $\mathbf{X}$. These programs are all semidefinite instances of low-rank matrix recovery problems [6, 10].

1.1 Convex Optimization Background

A common method of proving that a particular element $\mathbf{X}_0$ is a minimizer to matrix recovery problems is certification [10, 7, 5, 8, 11, 1]. We call the matrix $\mathbf{Y}$ a certificate of optimality if

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}_0 \rangle &\leq 0 \text{ for } \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{X} \succeq 0,\\ \langle \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}_0 \rangle &> 0 \text{ for } f(\mathbf{X}) < f(\mathbf{X}_0).\end{aligned}$$

That is, a certificate acts as the normal vector to a hyperplane that separates the feasible set from the set of strictly smaller objectives. By the separating hyperplane theorem, such a certificate exists if and only if $\mathbf{X}_0$ is a minimizer. By the mild assumptions on f (which establish it is Lipschitz on bounded sets), such a certificate can be taken to be of the form $\mathbf{Y} \in -\partial f(\mathbf{X}_0)$, where ∂f is the subdifferential of f.

In many cases, the certificate can be represented in terms of the problem's dual variables. As standard in dual formulation of a convex program [3], the Lagrangian of (1) is given by

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Q}) = f(\mathbf{X}) + \langle \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbf{b} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{X} \rangle.$$

where $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\text{sym}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^m$. The dual variables $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Q})$ are dual-feasible when $\mathbf{Q} \preceq 0$. We note that the subdifferential of $\mathcal{L}$ with respect to $\mathbf{X}$ and evaluated at $\mathbf{X}_0$ is $\partial\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{X}_0, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Q}) = \partial f(\mathbf{X}_0) + \mathcal{A}^*\boldsymbol{\lambda} + \mathbf{Q}$. The Lagrangian dual function is defined by $g(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Q}) = \inf_{\mathbf{X}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Q})$.

The dual problem for (1) is

$$\sup_{\mathbf{Q}\preceq 0, \boldsymbol{\lambda}} g(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Q}). \tag{2}$$

Let p^* and d^* be the optimal values of (1) and (2), respectively. The duality gap is $p^* - d^*$, which is always nonnegative. Problem (1) satisfies strong duality when the duality gap is zero.

We call $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Q})$ a dual certificate at $\mathbf{X}_0$ if

$$\mathcal{A}^*\boldsymbol{\lambda} + \mathbf{Q} \in -\partial f(\mathbf{X}_0), \tag{3}$$

$$\mathbf{Q} \preceq 0, \mathbf{Q} \perp \mathbf{X}_0. \tag{4}$$

That is, a dual certificate $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Q})$ defines a certificate of optimality, is dual feasible, and satisfies the complementary slackness condition. Sometimes, we will refer to $\mathbf{Y} = \mathcal{A}^*\boldsymbol{\lambda} + \mathbf{Q}$ as the dual certificate. To simplify notation, let the cone of candidate dual certificates be

$$S = \left\{ \mathcal{A}^*\boldsymbol{\lambda} + \mathbf{Q} \mid \mathbf{Q} \preceq 0, \mathbf{Q} \perp \mathbf{X}_0 \right\}. \tag{5}$$

That is, S is the direct sum of the range of $\mathcal{A}^*$ with the negative semidefinite cone orthogonal to $\mathbf{X}_0$.

Theorem 1. *If* $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Q})$ *is a dual certificate at* $\mathbf{X}_0$*, then* $\mathbf{X}_0$ *is a minimizer to* (1)*.*

By elementary arguments from convex optimization, a dual certificate is given by the optimizer of the dual problem.

Theorem 2. *Let* $\mathbf{X}_0$ *be a minimizer of* (1)*. The following are equivalent:*

(a) $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Q})$ *is a dual certificate at* $\mathbf{X}_0$*,*

(b) $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Q})$ *is dual optimal and strong duality holds.*

For the sake of completeness, we provide a proof of these elementary theorems in Section 2.

1.2 Examples without Dual Certificates

We provide two examples of semidefinite problems for which a dual certificate does not exist at a minimizer. To aid the analysis, let $\mathbf{e}_i$ be the ith standard basis vector, let $\mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{q} = \mathbf{y}\mathbf{q}^* + \mathbf{q}\mathbf{y}^*$ be the symmetric tensor product, let $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\mathrm{F}}$ be the Frobenius matrix norm, and note that

$$\mathbf{X} \succeq 0 \text{ and } \langle \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^* \rangle = 0 \text{ for } \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n \Rightarrow \mathbf{X}\mathbf{q} = 0 \Rightarrow \langle \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{q} \rangle = 0 \text{ for any } \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{6}$$

Example 1. *Let* $\mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{e}_1\mathbf{e}_1^*$*. There is no dual certificate at* $\mathbf{X}_0$ *for the problem*

$$\min \frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{X}\|_F^2 \text{ subject to } \mathbf{X} \succeq 0, \left\langle \mathbf{X}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle = 0, \left\langle \mathbf{X}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle = 1. \tag{7}$$

Further, this problem satisfies strong duality where the dual optimum is not achieved.

By (6), any feasible $\mathbf{X}$ for Example 1 satisfies $\langle \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{e}_1 \otimes \mathbf{e}_2 \rangle = 0$. Hence, the minimizer and only feasible point of (7) is $\mathbf{X}_0$. The subdifferential of $f(\mathbf{X}) = \frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2$ is $\partial f(\mathbf{X}_0) = \{\mathbf{X}_0\}$. We note that there is no dual certificate because there is no $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Q})$ satisfying $\mathbf{Q} \preceq 0, \mathbf{Q} \perp \mathbf{X}_0$, and

$$-\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \lambda_1 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \lambda_2 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \mathbf{Q}.$$

The dual problem for (7) is

$$\sup_{\mathbf{Q} \preceq 0, \boldsymbol{\lambda}} -\frac{1}{2}\left\| \lambda_1 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \lambda_2 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \mathbf{Q} \right\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2 - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_2.$$

Taking

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(\varepsilon)} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + 1/\varepsilon \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}, \; \mathbf{Q}^{(\varepsilon)} = \begin{pmatrix} -\varepsilon & 1 \\ 1 & -1/\varepsilon \end{pmatrix},$$

we see that $g(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(\varepsilon)}, \mathbf{Q}^{(\varepsilon)}) \to \frac{1}{2} = p^*$. Hence, there is no duality gap, and by Theorem 1 the dual optimum is not achieved. Further, any sequence of dual-feasible variables approaching the dual optimum necessarily diverges. To see this, consider $g(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(\varepsilon)}, \mathbf{Q}^{(\varepsilon)}) \to d^* = p^*$. If both $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(\varepsilon)}$ and $\mathbf{Q}^{(\varepsilon)}$ have a bounded subsequence, then there is a further subsequence that converges. By continuity of g for this example, there would be a dual optimal $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Q})$, which is a contradiction.

Note that if (7) were supplemented with the constraint $\langle \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{e}_1 \otimes \mathbf{e}_2 \rangle = 0$, there would exist a dual certificate at $\mathbf{X}_0$.

Example 2. *Let* $\mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{e}_1\mathbf{e}_1^*$*. There is no dual certificate at* $\mathbf{X}_0$ *for the problem*

$$\min \left\langle \mathbf{X}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle \text{ subject to } \mathbf{X} \succeq 0, \left\langle \mathbf{X}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle = 0.$$

Further, this problem does not satisfy strong duality.

For any $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Q})$ with $\mathbf{Q} \preceq 0$, $g(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Q}) = -\infty$. Hence the duality gap for this problem is infinite and strong duality does not hold.

1.3 Strong Duality and Semidefinite Programs

The lack of strong duality or dual attainment in semidefinite programs is well known in the literature [9]. It can be avoided when certain constraint qualifications hold. For example, Slater's condition requires the existence of a strictly feasible point in order to get strong duality [3]. A generalized Slater condition [2] requires a point in the relative interior of the cone of feasible points. In the present paper, we are interested in rank one solutions, which lie on the boundary of the semidefinite cone. Hence, we do not appeal to Slater-like conditions.

Without a constraint qualification, it is possible to achieve strong duality by regularizing the primal problem or considering an alternative to the Lagrangian dual. One method of regularization involves rewriting the primal problem in terms of the minimal cone [2, 14]. Alternative to the Lagrangian dual is the extended Lagrange-Slater Dual [13, 14], which can be written down in polynomial time.

1.4 Main Results

In this paper, we present a constraint qualification for the problem (1) to satisfy strong duality and dual attainment. This condition is different from Slater-like conditions because it does not explicitly consider the set of feasible points. Instead it focuses on whether or not there is any combination of measurement matrices that positive and orthogonal to X_0.

1.4.1 Sufficient condition for dual certificate existence

The lack of a dual certificate in the examples arrives because there is a linear combination of $\mathbf{A}_i$ that is positive semidefinite and orthogonal to $\mathbf{X}_0$. If this case is excluded, a dual certificate necessarily exists at the rank-one solution $\mathbf{X}_0$.

Theorem 3. *If* $\mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{x}_0\mathbf{x}_0^*$ *minimizes* (1) *and there does not exist a nonzero* $\mathbf{A} \in \mathit{span}\{\mathbf{A}_i\}_{i=1}^m$ *such that* $\mathbf{A} \succeq 0$ *and* $\mathbf{A} \perp \mathbf{X}_0$*, then there exists a dual certificate at* $\mathbf{X}_0$*.*

For some measurement matrices $\mathbf{A}_i$ of practical interest, Theorem 3 is applicable. For example, the following corollary implies a dual certificate exists with probability 1 if $\mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{x}_0\mathbf{x}_0^*$ minimizes (1) with $\mathbf{A}_i = \mathbf{z}_i\mathbf{z}_i^*$ for i.i.d. Gaussian $\mathbf{z}_i$ and $m \leq n$. This is the case arising in the compressive phase retrieval problem [11].

Corollary 1. *If* $\mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{x}_0\mathbf{x}_0^*$ *minimizes* (1) *and* $\{\mathbf{A}_i\mathbf{x}_0\}_{i=1}^m$ *are independent, then there exists a dual certificate at* $\mathbf{X}_0$*.*

1.4.2 Completeness condition implies dual certificate existence

If there is a positive semidefinite measurement matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \text{span}\{\mathbf{A}_i\}$ that is orthogonal to $\mathbf{X}_0$, then (6) provides additional constraints on $\mathbf{X}$ that may or may not be implied by $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{b}$ alone. For any eigenvector $\mathbf{q}$ corresponding to a positive eigenvalue of $\mathbf{A}$, and for any $\mathbf{y}$, all feasible $\mathbf{X}$ satisfy $\langle \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{q}\rangle = 0$. If each of these $\mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{q}$ already belong to the cone of candidate dual certificates S, then we consider the measurements 'complete', and we prove a dual certificate necessarily exists.

Theorem 4. *If* $\mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{x}_0\mathbf{x}_0^*$ *minimizes* (1) *and* $S = \{\mathcal{A}^*\boldsymbol{\lambda} + \mathbf{Q} \mid \mathbf{Q} \preceq 0, \mathbf{Q} \perp \mathbf{X}_0\}$ *satisfies the completeness condition*

$$\mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^* \in S \text{ and } \mathbf{q} \perp \mathbf{x}_0 \Rightarrow \mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{q} \in S \ \forall \mathbf{y}, \tag{8}$$

then there exists a dual certificate at $\mathbf{X}_0$*.*

We note that completeness of S does not imply that $\mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{q} \in \text{span}\ \{\mathbf{A}_i\}$. That is, $\langle \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{q} \rangle = 0$ need not be implied by $A(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{b}$. Instead, completeness requires that $\mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{q}$ differs from $\text{span}\{\mathbf{A}_i\}$ by something negative.

1.4.3 Completion process

If the problem (1) does not satisfy the completeness condition (8), an optimality certificate for (1) can be expressed as a dual certificate for the problem augmented with linear constraints implied by $\mathbf{X} \succeq 0$, $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{b}$. This completed problem is equivalent to (1) and its existence is a corollary of Theorem 4.

Corollary 2. *If $\mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{x}_0\mathbf{x}_0^*$ minimizes (1), then there exists an equivalent equivalent problem*

$$\min f(\mathbf{X}) \textit{ such that } \mathbf{X} \succeq 0, \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{X}) = \tilde{\mathbf{b}} \tag{9}$$

such that there exists a dual certificate at $\mathbf{X}_0$. This problem is equivalent to (1) in the sense that $\mathbf{X} \succeq 0$ and $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{b} \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{X} \succeq 0$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{X}) = \tilde{\mathbf{b}}$.

The following procedure outlines how to complete the set of measurement matrices $\{\mathbf{A}_i\}$ in order to obtain an equivalent problem satisfying the completeness condition (8):

1. Consider all $\mathbf{A} \succeq 0, \mathbf{A} \in \text{span}\{\mathbf{A}_i\}, \langle \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{X}_0 \rangle = 0$.
2. Write each $\mathbf{A} = \sum_k c_k \mathbf{q}_k \mathbf{q}_k^*$ with $c_k > 0$.
3. For every j, if $\mathbf{e}_j \otimes \mathbf{q}_k \notin \text{span}\{\mathbf{A}_i\}$, append $\langle \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{e}_j \otimes \mathbf{q}_k \rangle = 0$ to $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{b}$.
4. Repeat until $\mathcal{A}$ remains unchanged.

This process will terminate after finitely many repetitions because $\dim(\text{span}\{\mathbf{A}_i\})$ increases each time. Because the resulting $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ will satisfy (8), we apply Theorem 4 and have thus proven Corollary 2. Unfortunately, the semidefinite feasibility problem implicit to step 1 is of unknown computational complexity [13]. Hence, this procedure is of limited computational use.

1.4.4 Weak necessity of the completeness condition

If the measurement matrices fail to satisfy the completeness condition (8), a particular problem of form (1) may or may not have a dual certificate at a minimizer $\mathbf{X}_0$. Nonetheless, there is a problem for which a dual certificate does not exist.

Theorem 5. *Fix $\mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{x}_0\mathbf{x}_0^*$ and the matrices $\{\mathbf{A}_i\}_{i=1}^m$. If S does not satisfy the completeness condition (8), there exists a convex problem (1) such that $\mathbf{X}_0$ is a minimizer and a dual certificate does not exist at $\mathbf{X}_0$.*

This weak form of necessity of the completeness condition arises in part because of an equivalence between completeness and the additivity of subgradients of indicator functions over the constraints, as proven in Lemma 1.

1.4.5 Implication for numerical optimization

As illustrated by Example 1, semidefinite problems that fail the completeness condition (8) may not have dual optimal variables. It can be the case that dual variable diverge whenever $g(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(\varepsilon)}, \mathbf{Q}^{(\varepsilon)}) \to d^*$, even when strong duality holds. Hence, any numerical scheme that explicitly represents $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Q})$ can not be convergent in these variables. Such dual methods may still provide reasonable solutions and estimates of the duality gap. Nonetheless, if they require convergence in dual variables, their theoretical foundation becomes unclear. Also, any dual method becomes prone to large relative errors when forming quantities like $\mathbf{Y} = \mathcal{A}^*\boldsymbol{\lambda} + \mathbf{Q}$. The possible divergence of dual variables can be avoided by implementing a completion process like in Section 1.4.3, or by considering an alternative dual formulation, such as the extended Lagrange-Slater dual [14].

1.5 Organization of this paper

In Section 1.6, we present the notation used throughout the paper. In Section 2, we prove Theorems 1 and 2 which are elementary results from convex optimization. In Section 3, we prove Theorems 3–5 and Corollary 1. Corollary 2 was proven in Section 1.4.3. The proofs of Theorems 3 and 4 rely on technical lemmas concerning the additivity of subdifferentials of indicator functions, and on the closedness of S. These lemmas are proven in Section 4.

1.6 Notation

Let $\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\text{sym}}$ be the space of symmetric, real-valued matrices of size n. Matrices will be denoted with boldface capital letters, and vectors will be denoted with boldface lowercase letters. Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ be the usual inner product for vectors and the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product for matrices. Let $\mathbf{x} \otimes \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x}\mathbf{y}^* + \mathbf{y}\mathbf{x}^*$ be the symmetric tensor product. For a subspace $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, let $V^\perp$ be the orthogonal complement with respect to the ordinary inner product. Let $\mathbf{I}_{V^\perp}$ be the matrix corresponding to orthogonal projection of vectors onto $V^\perp$. Let $\mathcal{P}_{V^\perp}\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{I}_{V^\perp}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{I}_{V^\perp}$ be the projection of symmetric matrices onto symmetric matrices with row and column spans in $V^\perp$. Let $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{x}_0^\perp}$ be the special case in the instance where $V = \text{span}\{\mathbf{x}_0\}$. In the special case where $\mathbf{x}_0$ is the coordinate basis element $\mathbf{e}_1$, $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{x}_0^\perp}\mathbf{X}$ is the restriction of $\mathbf{X}$ to the lower-right $n-1 \times n-1$ block.

Let the indicator function for the set Ω be

$$I_\Omega(\mathbf{X}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{X} \in \Omega, \\ +\infty & \text{if } \mathbf{X} \notin \Omega. \end{cases}$$

2 Proofs of Background Theorems 1 and 2

Theorems 1 and 2 follow from classical arguments in convex optimization.

Proof of Theorem 1. Consider a feasible $\mathbf{X}$. Because $\mathcal{A}^*\boldsymbol{\lambda} + \mathbf{Q} \in -\partial f(\mathbf{X}_0)$,

$$f(\mathbf{X}) - f(\mathbf{X}_0) \geq -\langle \mathcal{A}^*\boldsymbol{\lambda} + \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}_0 \rangle = -\langle \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{X} \rangle \geq 0,$$

where the last equality uses $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}_0)$ and $\mathbf{Q} \perp \mathbf{X}_0$, and the last equality uses $\mathbf{Q} \preceq 0$ and $\mathbf{X} \succeq 0$. □

Proof of Theorem 2. To prove (a) ⇒ (b), we observe that (3) implies $0 \in \partial_{\mathbf{X}}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{X}_0, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Q})$. Hence, $\mathbf{X}_0$ minimizes $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Q})$ over $\mathbf{X}$. Hence $g(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Q}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{X}_0, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Q})$. By slackness and feasibility of $\mathbf{X}_0$, $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{X}_0, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Q}) = f(\mathbf{X}_0) = p^*$. Hence $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Q})$ is dual optimal and strong duality holds.

To prove (b) ⇒ (a), we observe that strong duality and dual optimality of $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Q})$ imply

$$f(\mathbf{X}_0) = \inf_{\mathbf{X}} f(\mathbf{X}) + \langle \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) - b\rangle + \langle \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{X}\rangle \tag{10}$$

In particular,$f(\mathbf{X}_0) \leq f(\mathbf{X}_0) + \langle \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}_0) - b\rangle + \langle \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{X}_0\rangle$, which implies $\langle \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{X}_0\rangle \geq 0$ by feasibility of $\mathbf{X}_0$. By dual feasibility, $\mathbf{Q} \preceq 0$ and hence $\langle \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{X}_0\rangle \leq 0$. We thus have $\mathbf{Q} \perp \mathbf{X}_0$. The infimum in (10) is achieved by $\mathbf{X}_0$. Hence, $0 \in \partial_{\mathbf{X}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{X}_0, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Q})$, and we conclude $\mathcal{A}^* \boldsymbol{\lambda} + \mathbf{Q} \in -\partial f(\mathbf{X}_0)$. □

3 Proofs of Main Results

In this section, we present the proofs of the main theorems and Corollary 1.

3.1 Proof of Theorems 3 and 4 and Corollary 1

Under the assumptions of Theorem 3, the set S trivially satisfies the completeness condition (8). The theorem is thus a special case of Theorem 4, and we will prove them together.

The strategy of proof involves rewriting (1) in an unconstrained form. Existence of a dual certificate is guaranteed when the subdifferentials of the sum of two indicator functions is the sum of their respective subdifferentials. In Lemma 1, we use a separating hyperplane argument to prove additivity of these subdifferentials under the condition (8).

Proof of Theorems 3 and 4. We first rewrite the problem (1) without constraints. $\mathbf{X}_0$ minimizes (1) if and only if $\mathbf{X}_0$ minimizes the problem

$$\min f(\mathbf{X}) + I_{\mathbf{X} \succeq 0, \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{X}), \tag{11}$$

which, by convexity, happens if and only if

$$0 \in \partial(f + I_{\mathbf{X} \succeq 0, \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{b}})(\mathbf{X}_0). \tag{12}$$

By assumption, f is continuous everywhere. Hence, the Moreau-Rockefellar Theorem [15] guarantees that

$$\partial(f + I_{\mathbf{X} \succeq 0, \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{b}})(\mathbf{X}_0) = \partial f(\mathbf{X}_0) + \partial I_{\mathbf{X} \succeq 0, \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{X}_0). \tag{13}$$

By Lemma 1, the completeness condition (8) is equivalent to

$$\partial I_{\mathbf{X} \succeq 0, \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{X}_0) = \partial I_{\mathbf{X} \succeq 0}(\mathbf{X}_0) + \partial I_{\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{X}_0). \tag{14}$$

We note that

$$\partial I_{\mathbf{X} \succeq 0}(\mathbf{X}_0) = \{\mathbf{Q} \mid \mathbf{Q} \preceq 0, \mathbf{Q} \perp \mathbf{X}_0\}, \tag{15}$$

$$\partial I_{\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{X}_0) = \{\mathcal{A}^* \boldsymbol{\lambda}\}, \tag{16}$$

$$\partial I_{\mathbf{X} \succeq 0}(\mathbf{X}_0) + \partial I_{\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{X}_0) = \{\mathcal{A}^* \boldsymbol{\lambda} + \mathbf{Q} \mid \mathbf{Q} \preceq 0, \mathbf{Q} \perp \mathbf{X}_0\} = S. \tag{17}$$

We conclude there exists a dual certificate $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Q})$ by combining (12), (13), (14), and (17). □

The corollary follows from Theorem 3 because the independence assumption implies that there are no nontrivial linear combinations of measurement matrices that are positive and orthogonal to $\mathbf{X}_0$.

Proof of Corollary 1. Consider $\mathbf{A} \succeq 0$, $\mathbf{A} = \sum_i \lambda_i \mathbf{A}_i$, $\mathbf{A} \perp \mathbf{x}_0 \mathbf{x}_0^*$. By (6), $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_0 = 0$. Hence, $\sum_i \lambda_i \mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{x}_0 = 0$. By independence of $\{\mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{x}_0\}$, $\lambda_i = 0$ for all i. Hence the conditions of Theorem 3 are met and there exists a dual certificate at $\mathbf{X}_0$.

□

3.2 Proof of Theorem 5

Theorem 5 provides a weak form of necessity for the completeness condition (8). If $-\partial f(\mathbf{X}_0)$ only contains matrices that are not of form S, there will be no dual certificate. When S does not satisfy (8), there is a matrix orthogonal to all feasible points, and we choose f to have a gradient in the opposite direction. This argument also plays an important role in the primary technical lemma establishing equivalence between the completeness condition and additivity of subgradients.

Proof of Theorem 5. If S does not satisfy the completeness condition (8), then there is a $\mathbf{q} \perp \mathbf{x}_0$ and a $\mathbf{y}$ such that $\mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^* \in S$ and $\mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{q} \notin S$. Consider the problem

$$\min \langle -\mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{X} \rangle \text{ subject to } \mathbf{X} \succeq 0, \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}_0). \tag{18}$$

Because $\mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^* \in S$, $\mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^* = \mathcal{A}^*\boldsymbol{\lambda} + \mathbf{Q}$ for some $\mathbf{Q} \preceq 0$, $\mathbf{Q} \perp \mathbf{X}_0$. Hence,

$$\langle \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^* \rangle = \langle \mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}_0, \mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^* \rangle = \langle \mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}_0, \mathcal{A}^*\boldsymbol{\lambda} + \mathbf{Q} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}_0, \mathbf{Q} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Q} \rangle \leq 0,$$

where the third equality uses $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}_0) = 0$. Because feasibility of $\mathbf{X}$ implies $\langle \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^* \rangle \geq 0$, we conclude all feasible $\mathbf{X} \perp \mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^*$. Hence, $\langle -\mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{X} \rangle = 0$ for any feasible $\mathbf{X}$. Hence $\mathbf{X}_0$ is a minimizer. There is no dual certificate because $-\partial f(\mathbf{X}_0)$ contains the single element $\mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{q} \notin S$. ☐

4 Technical Lemmas

The main technical lemma establishes additivity of subgradients of a class of indicator functions. One direction follows from the same argument as the proof of Theorem 5. The other direction follows by showing $\mathbf{Y} \notin S \Rightarrow \mathbf{Y} \notin \partial I_{\mathbf{X} \succeq 0, \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{X}_0)$. To show $\mathbf{Y}$ is not such a subgradient, we explicitly build a feasible $\mathbf{X}$ using a separating hyperplane argument. That argument requires S be closed, as proven in Lemma 2. It also hinges on Lemma 4 which classifies when perturbations from $\mathbf{X}_0$ remain positive semidefinite.

Lemma 1. *Let* $\mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{x}_0\mathbf{x}_0^*$ *and* $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}_0) = b$. $S = \{\mathcal{A}^*\boldsymbol{\lambda} + \mathbf{Q} \mid \mathbf{Q} \preceq 0, \mathbf{Q} \perp \mathbf{X}_0\}$ *satisfies the completeness condition* (8) *if and only if*

$$\partial I_{\mathbf{X} \succeq 0, \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{X}_0) = \partial I_{\mathbf{X} \succeq 0}(\mathbf{X}_0) + \partial I_{\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{X}_0). \tag{19}$$

Proof of Lemma 1. First, we show $\neg(8) \Rightarrow \neg(19)$. There exists $\mathbf{q} \perp \mathbf{x}_0$ such that $\mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^* \in S$ but $\mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{q} \notin S$ for some $\mathbf{y}$. Following the calculation in the proof of Theorem 5, all feasible $\mathbf{X}$ are orthogonal to $\mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{q}$. Hence, $\mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{q} \in \partial I_{\mathbf{X} \succeq 0, \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{X}_0)$, but $\mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{q} \notin S = \partial I_{\mathbf{X} \succeq 0}(\mathbf{X}_0) + \partial I_{\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{X}_0)$.

Next, we show $(8) \Rightarrow (19)$. One inclusion in (19) is automatic:

$$\partial I_{\mathbf{X} \succeq 0, \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{X}_0) = \partial (I_{\mathbf{X} \succeq 0} + I_{\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{b}})(\mathbf{X}_0) \supset \partial I_{\mathbf{X} \succeq 0}(\mathbf{X}_0) + \partial I_{\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{X}_0). \tag{20}$$

To prove the other inclusion, we let $\mathbf{Y} \notin S = \partial I_{\mathbf{X} \succeq 0}(\mathbf{X}_0) + \partial I_{\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{X}_0)$. We will show that $\mathbf{Y} \notin \partial I_{\mathbf{X} \succeq 0, \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{X}_0)$ by exhibiting a feasible $\mathbf{X}$ such that $\langle \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}_0 \rangle > 0$.

As we will prove in Lemma 2, (8) implies that S is closed. By the separating hyperplane theorem, for any $\mathbf{Z} \notin S$, there exists a $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{Z}}$ such that

$$\mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{Z}}) = 0, \tag{21}$$

$$\langle \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{Z}}, \mathbf{Q} \rangle \leq 0 \text{ for all } \mathbf{Q} \preceq 0, \mathbf{Q} \perp \mathbf{X}_0, \tag{22}$$

$$\langle \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{Z}}, \mathbf{M} \rangle = 0 \text{ if } \pm \mathbf{M} \in S, \tag{23}$$

$$\langle \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{Z}}, \mathbf{Z} \rangle > 0. \tag{24}$$

We observe that (22) implies $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{x}_0^\perp}\mathbf{\Lambda}_\mathbf{Z} \succeq 0$.

Let $B = \{\mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^* \mid \mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^* \perp \mathbf{X}_0, \mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^* \notin S\}$. We will build a $\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}$ satisfying the following properties:

$$\mathcal{A}(\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}) = 0, \tag{25}$$

$$\langle \tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}, \mathbf{Q}\rangle \leq 0 \text{ for all } \mathbf{Q} \preceq 0, \mathbf{Q} \perp \mathbf{X}_0, \tag{26}$$

$$\langle \tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}, \mathbf{M}\rangle = 0 \text{ if } \pm\mathbf{M} \in S, \tag{27}$$

$$\langle \tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}, \mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^*\rangle > 0 \text{ for all } \mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^* \in B. \tag{28}$$

We build $\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}$ through the following process. Choose a $\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{q}_1^* \in B$ and find a corresponding $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{q}_1^*}$. Restrict B to a set $\tilde{B}$ containing only the elements that are orthogonal to $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{q}_1^*}$. All elements in $B \setminus \tilde{B}$ have a positive inner product with $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{q}_1^*}$. Choose $\mathbf{q}_2\mathbf{q}_2^* \in \tilde{B}$ and find $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{q}_2\mathbf{q}_2^*}$. Further restrict $\tilde{B}$ to only the elements that are orthogonal to $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{q}_2\mathbf{q}_2^*}$. Now, all elements in $B \setminus \tilde{B}$ have a positive inner product with $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{q}_1^*}$ or $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{q}_2\mathbf{q}_2^*}$. Repeat this process until B is empty. The process will complete after a finite number of repetitions because the set $\tilde{B}$ is restricted to a space of strictly decreasing dimension at each step. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}} = \sum_i \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{q}_i\mathbf{q}_i^*}$. We observe (25)–(27) hold due to (21)–(23). Every element of B has a positive inner product with $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{q}_i\mathbf{q}_i^*}$ for some i. Hence, we have (28).

Let $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \mathbf{\Lambda Y} + \varepsilon\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}$, where ε is small enough that $\langle \mathbf{\Lambda}, \mathbf{Y}\rangle > 0$. By Lemma 4, if (a) $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{x}_0^\perp}\mathbf{\Lambda} \succeq 0$ and (b) $\mathbf{\Lambda} \perp \mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^*$ and $\mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^* \perp \mathbf{X}_0 \Rightarrow \mathbf{\Lambda} \perp \mathbf{x}_0 \otimes \mathbf{q}$, then there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\mathbf{X}_0 + \delta\mathbf{\Lambda} \succeq 0$. By (22) and (26), (a) holds. To show (b) holds, we consider a $\mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^* \perp \mathbf{\Lambda}$, $\mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^* \perp \mathbf{X}_0$. By (28) and the definition of $\mathbf{\Lambda}$, $\mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^*$ must be in S. By (8), $\pm\mathbf{x}_0 \otimes \mathbf{q} \in S$. Hence, by (23) and (27), $\mathbf{\Lambda} \perp \mathbf{x}_0 \otimes \mathbf{q}$, and (b) holds.

As given by Lemma 4, let $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}_0 + \delta\mathbf{\Lambda}$. Because $\mathbf{X} \succeq 0$ and $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{\Lambda}) = 0$, $\mathbf{X}$ is feasible. Additionally, $\langle \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}_0\rangle > 0$ because $\langle \mathbf{\Lambda}, \mathbf{Y}\rangle > 0$. Hence, $\mathbf{Y} \notin \partial I_{\mathbf{X}\succeq 0, \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X})=\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{X}_0)$.

□

The hyperplane separation argument above requires that S be closed. The following lemma reduces the closedness of $S \subset \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\text{sym}}$ to an $n-1 \times n-1$ case without the orthogonality constraint, which is proved in Lemma 3.

Lemma 2. *If $S = \{\sum_i \lambda_i\mathbf{A}_i + \mathbf{Q} \mid \mathbf{Q} \preceq 0, \mathbf{Q} \perp \mathbf{X}_0\}$ satisfies the completeness condition* (8) *then S is closed.*

Proof of Lemma 2. Without loss of generality let $\mathbf{X}_0 = e_1e_1^*$. This can be seen by letting V be an orthogonal matrix with $\mathbf{x}_0/\|\mathbf{x}_0\|$ in the first column, and by considering the set V^*SV. If necessary, linearly recombine the $\mathbf{A}_i$ such that the first columns of $\mathbf{A}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{A}_\ell$ are independent and the first columns of the remaining $\mathbf{A}_{\ell+1}, \ldots, \mathbf{A}_m$ are zero.

Consider a Cauchy sequence $\mathbf{A}^{(k)} + \mathbf{Q}^{(k)} \to \mathbf{X}$, where $\mathbf{A}^{(k)} = \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i^{(k)}\mathbf{A}_i$. We will establish that $\mathbf{X} \in S$. Because $\mathbf{Q}^{(k)} \preceq 0$ and $\mathbf{Q}^{(k)} \perp \mathbf{e}_1\mathbf{e}_1^*$, it is zero in the first row and column. Hence the first column of $\sum_{i=1}^\ell \lambda_i^{(k)}\mathbf{A}_i$ converges to the first column of $\mathbf{X}$. By independence, we obtain that $\lambda_i^{(k)}$ converges to some $\lambda_i^{(\infty)}$ for each $1 \leq i \leq \ell$. As a result,

$$\sum_{i=\ell+1}^m \lambda_i^{(k)}\mathbf{A}_i + \mathbf{Q}^{(k)} \to \overline{\mathbf{X}},$$

where $\overline{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{X} - \sum_{i=1}^\ell \lambda_i^{(\infty)}\mathbf{A}_i$, and $\overline{\mathbf{X}}$ is zero in the first row and column.

The problem has now been reduced to one of size $n-1 \times n-1$ without an orthogonality constraint, and Lemma 3 completes the proof. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_i$ be the lower-right $n-1 \times n-1$ sub matrix of $\mathbf{A}_i$. Let $\tilde{S} = \{\sum_{i=\ell+1}^{m} \lambda_i \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_i + \tilde{\mathbf{Q}} \mid \tilde{\mathbf{Q}} \preceq 0\} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1\times n-1}_{\text{sym}}$. If $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^* \in \tilde{S}$ then $\begin{pmatrix}0\\ \tilde{\mathbf{q}}\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}0\\ \tilde{\mathbf{q}}\end{pmatrix}^* \in S$. By (8), $\begin{pmatrix}0\\ \tilde{\mathbf{y}}\end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix}0\\ \tilde{\mathbf{q}}\end{pmatrix} \in S \ \forall \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. By independence of the first columns of $\mathbf{A}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{A}_\ell$, $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} \otimes \tilde{\mathbf{q}} \in \tilde{S}$. The conditions of Lemma 3 are met. Hence, $\overline{\mathbf{X}} = \sum_{i=\ell+1}^{m} \lambda_i^{(\infty)} \mathbf{A}_i + \mathbf{Q}^{(\infty)}$ with $\mathbf{Q}^{(\infty)} \preceq 0, \mathbf{Q}^{(\infty)} \perp e_1 e_1^*$. We conclude $\mathbf{X} \in S$ and S is closed.

□

The closedness of S above relies on the closedness of a lower dimensional $\tilde{S}$ without the orthogonality constraint. For any Cauchy sequence in $\tilde{S}$, we show the limit belongs to $\tilde{S}$. If there is no intersection between the range of $\mathcal{A}^*$ and the space of negative semidefinite matrices, then these sets have a fixed angle between them. Hence, dual variables corresponding to a Cauchy sequence within $\tilde{S}$ can not diverge separately yet converge when combined. If there is an intersection between the range of $\mathcal{A}^*$ and the space of negative semidefinite matrices, the variant of the completeness condition allows us to project away from those directions.

Lemma 3. *The set* $\tilde{S} = \{\sum_i \lambda_i \mathbf{A}_i + \mathbf{Q} \mid \mathbf{Q} \preceq 0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{sym}$ *is closed if*

$$\mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^* \in \tilde{S} \Rightarrow \mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{q} \in \tilde{S} \ \forall \mathbf{y}. \tag{29}$$

Proof of Lemma 3. Consider a Cauchy sequence $\mathbf{A}^{(k)} + \mathbf{Q}^{(k)} \to \mathbf{X}$, where $\mathbf{A}^{(k)} = \sum_i \lambda_i^{(k)} \mathbf{A}_i$. Let $V = \operatorname{span}\{\mathbf{q} \mid \mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^* \in \tilde{S}\}$. For each $\mathbf{q} \in V$, (29) gives that $\mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{q} \in \tilde{S} \ \forall \mathbf{y}$. Because $\mathcal{P}_{V^\perp}$ is the projection of matrices onto matrices with row and column spaces living in $V^\perp$,

$$\pm(\mathbf{X} - \mathcal{P}_{V^\perp}\mathbf{X}) \in \tilde{S} \text{ for any } \mathbf{X}. \tag{30}$$

The Cauchy sequence satisfies

$$\mathcal{P}_{V^\perp}\mathbf{A}^{(k)} + \mathcal{P}_{V^\perp}\mathbf{Q}^{(k)} \to \mathcal{P}_{V^\perp}\mathbf{X}. \tag{31}$$

If $\|\mathcal{P}_{V^\perp}\mathbf{A}^{(k)}\|_{\mathrm{F}} \to \infty$, then $\frac{\|\mathcal{P}_{V^\perp}\mathbf{A}^{(k)}\|_{\mathrm{F}}}{\|\mathcal{P}_{V^\perp}\mathbf{Q}^{(k)}\|_{\mathrm{F}}} \to 1$ and $\left\langle \frac{\mathcal{P}_{V^\perp}\mathbf{A}^{(k)}}{\|\mathcal{P}_{V^\perp}\mathbf{A}^{(k)}\|_{\mathrm{F}}}, \frac{\mathcal{P}_{V^\perp}\mathbf{Q}^{(k)}}{\|\mathcal{P}_{V^\perp}\mathbf{Q}^{(k)}\|_{\mathrm{F}}} \right\rangle \to -1$ as $k \to \infty$. The sets $\{\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{P}_{V^\perp}\operatorname{span} \mathbf{A}_i\} \cap \{\|\mathbf{A}\|_{\mathrm{F}} = 1\}$ and $\{\mathbf{Q} \preceq 0\} \cap \{\|\mathbf{Q}\|_{\mathrm{F}} = 1\}$ are compact. Hence $\langle \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{Q} \rangle$ achieves its minimum. That minimum value must be -1, which implies that there exists a nonzero, positive semidefinite matrix $-\mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{P}_{V^\perp}\operatorname{span} \mathbf{A}_i$. This is is impossible by the construction of V. Suppose $\mathcal{P}_{V^\perp}\mathcal{A}^*\boldsymbol{\lambda} \succeq 0$. By (30), we see $\mathcal{P}_{V^\perp}\mathcal{A}^*\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \tilde{S}$. Hence every rank-1 component $\mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^*$ of $\mathcal{P}_{V^\perp}\mathcal{A}^*\boldsymbol{\lambda} \succeq 0$ belongs to $\tilde{S}$. We reach a contradiction because $\mathbf{q}$ would belong to V and can not be in the column space of $\mathcal{P}_{V^\perp}\mathcal{A}^*\boldsymbol{\lambda}$.

Hence, $\mathcal{P}_{V^\perp}\mathbf{A}^{(k)}$ has a bounded subsequence. Thus, there is a further subsequence that converges and $\mathcal{P}_{V^\perp}\mathbf{X}$ is of the form $\mathcal{P}_{V^\perp}(\sum_i \lambda_i^{(\infty)}\mathbf{A}_i + \mathbf{Q}^{(\infty)})$. By (30), we conclude $\mathbf{X} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \lambda_i^{(\infty)}\mathbf{A}_i + \mathbf{Q}^{(\infty)}$ with $\mathbf{Q}^{(\infty)} \preceq 0$.

□

The following lemma establishes a necessary and sufficient condition for when a symmetric perturbation from a positive rank 1 matrix remains positive.

Lemma 4. *Let* $\mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{x}_0\mathbf{x}_0^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$. $\mathbf{X}_0 + \delta\boldsymbol{\Lambda} \succeq 0$ *for some* $\delta > 0$ *if and only if (a)* $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{x}_0^\perp}\boldsymbol{\Lambda} \succeq 0$ *and (b)* $\boldsymbol{\Lambda} \perp \mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^*$ *and* $\mathbf{q} \perp \mathbf{x}_0 \Rightarrow \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \perp \mathbf{x}_0 \otimes \mathbf{q}$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume $\mathbf{X}_0 = e_1 e_1^*$. In this case $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{x}_0^\perp}$ is the restriction to the lower-right $n-1 \times n-1$ block. Let $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{x}_0^\perp} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1 \times n-1}_{\text{sym}}$ be that lower-right block of $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$. Write the block form

$$\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda_{11} & \boldsymbol{\rho}^* \\ \boldsymbol{\rho} & \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{x}_0^\perp} \end{pmatrix}.$$

First we prove $\mathbf{X}_0 + \delta\boldsymbol{\Lambda} \succeq 0 \Rightarrow$ (a) and (b). We immediately have (a) because $\mathbf{X}_0$ is zero on the lower-right subblock. Using a Schur complement,

$$\text{if } 1 + \delta\Lambda_{11} > 0, \text{ then } \mathbf{X}_0 + \delta\boldsymbol{\Lambda} \succeq 0 \Leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{x}_0^\perp} - \frac{\delta}{1+\delta\Lambda_{11}} \boldsymbol{\rho}\boldsymbol{\rho}^* \succeq 0. \tag{32}$$

If necessary, δ can be reduced to enforce $1 + \delta\Lambda_{11} > 0$. If (b) does not hold, then there is $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ such that $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{x}_0^\perp} \perp \boldsymbol{\xi}\boldsymbol{\xi}^*$ and $\boldsymbol{\rho} \not\perp \boldsymbol{\xi}$. By testing against $\boldsymbol{\xi}$, we see $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{x}_0^\perp} - \frac{\delta}{1+\delta\Lambda_{11}} \boldsymbol{\rho}\boldsymbol{\rho}^* \not\succeq 0$

Second, we prove (a) and (b) $\Rightarrow \mathbf{X}_0 + \delta\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ for some $\delta > 0$. Assume (a) and (b) hold. Using the property (32) about Schur complements, it suffices to show

$$\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{x}_0^\perp} - \frac{\delta}{1+\delta\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{11}} \boldsymbol{\rho}\boldsymbol{\rho}^* \succeq 0. \tag{33}$$

Let $V = \text{span}\,\{\mathbf{q} \mid \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{x}_0^\perp} \perp \mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^*\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1\times n-1}_{\text{sym}}$. There is some ϵ such that $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{x}_0^\perp} \succeq \epsilon \mathbf{I}_{V^\perp}$. If not, there would be a sequence of $\mathbf{x}^{(\varepsilon)} \in V^\perp$ such that $\|\mathbf{x}^{(\varepsilon)}\| = 1$ and $0 < \mathbf{x}^{(\varepsilon)} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{x}_0^\perp} \mathbf{x}^{(\varepsilon)*} < \varepsilon$. Such $\mathbf{x}^{(\varepsilon)}$ would have a convergent subsequence to some $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} \in V^\perp$ such that $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{x}_0^\perp} \mathbf{x}^{(0)*} = 0$, which is impossible by choice of V.

We note that for any $\mathbf{q} \in V$, (b) guarantees $\boldsymbol{\rho} \perp \mathbf{q}$. Hence $\boldsymbol{\rho} \in V^\perp$ and there is a sufficiently small δ such that $\frac{\delta}{1+\delta\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{11}} \boldsymbol{\rho}\boldsymbol{\rho}^* \preceq \varepsilon \mathbf{I}_{V^\perp}$. We conclude that (33) holds, and hence $\exists \delta > 0$ such that $\mathbf{X}_0 + \delta\boldsymbol{\Lambda} \succeq 0$. □

Acknowledgements

P.H. is partially supported by an NSF Mathematical Sciences Postdoctoral Research Fellowship. This work was substantially aided by discussions with Laurent Demanet that led to the formulation of the problem. The author also acknowledges Radu Balan for useful discussions.

References

[1] A. Ahmed, B. Recht, J. Romberg. Blind Deconvolution using Convex Programming. arXiv preprint 1211.5608, 2012

[2] J. Borwein, H. Wolkowicz. Regularizing the Abstract Convex Program *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 83, 495–530, 1981.

[3] S. Boyd, L. Vandenberghe. *Convex Optimization.* Cambridge University Press, 2004.

[4] E. J. Candes, Y. Eldar, T. Strohmer,V. Voroninski. Phase retrieval via matrix completion. *SIAM J. on Imaging Sciences* 6(1), 2011. 199–225.

[5] E. J. Candes, X. Li. Solving Quadratic Equations via PhaseLift when There Are About As Many Equations as Unknowns. arXiv 1208.6247, 2012

[6] E. J. Candes, B. Recht. Exact matrix completion via convex optimization. *Found. of Comput. Math.*, 9, 2008. 717–772.

[7] E. J. Candes, T. Strohmer, V. Voroninski. PhaseLift: Exact and Stable Signal Recovery from Magnitude Measurements via Convex Programming To appear in *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 2012

[8] L. Demanet, P. Hand. Stable optimizationless recovery from phaseless linear measurements. arXiv preprint 1208.1803, 2012

[9] R. Rm. Freund. *Complexity of an Algorithm for Finding an Approximate Solution of a Semidefinite Program with No Regularity Assumption*, Technical report OR 302-94, MIT, Cambridge, MA, 1994.

[10] D. Gross. Recovery Low-Rank Matrices From Few Coefficients In Any Basis. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 57(3), Mar 2011

[11] X. Li, V. Voroninski. Sparse Signal Recovery from Quadratic Measurements via Convex Programming. arXiv preprint 1209.4785, 2012

[12] H. Ohlsson, A. Y. Yang, R. Dong, S. S. Sastry. Compressive phase retrieval from squared output measurements via semidefinite programming. arXiv preprint 1111.6323, 2012.

[13] M. V. Ramana, *An Exact Duality Theory for Semidefinite Programming and its Complexity Implications*, DIMACS Technical report 95-02R, RUTCOR, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, 1995.

[14] M. V. Ramana, L. Tuncel, H. Wolkowicz. Strong Duality for Semidefinite Programming *SIAM J. Optim.* 7(3), 641–662, 1997.

[15] R. Rockafellar. *Convex Analysis.* Princeton University Press, 1970